

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 12, 2003. Claims 1 to 4 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 2 having been amended and Claims 3 and 4 having been added. Claims 1 and 3 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The title was objected to as allegedly being non-descriptive. The title has been amended to make it even more descriptive of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was objected to for an informality that has been attended to by amendment as recited above. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to address some informalities noted in a review of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,084,638 (Hare), and Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hare. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns controlling the display on a display apparatus, such as a TV monitor. According to the invention, the display apparatus (e.g., TV monitor 120) effects control of a display unit thereof (e.g., display device 127 and display interface 126) so that the display unit operates as a monitor of an external apparatus (e.g., computer (PC) 101) if a first mode (e.g., PC mode 401) is selected by a remote controller (e.g., remote controller 144), and the display unit is controlled so as to operate as a monitor of the display apparatus (i.e., as a television) if a second mode (e.g., TV mode

406) is selected by the remote controller. (See, for example, page 14, lines 7 to 24.) As a result, the TV can operate to display a TV signal in one mode, and can operate as a monitor of a computer in another mode, where a user can operate input/output devices connected to the TV.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a display apparatus, comprising a remote controller, a display unit, a connecting unit which forms a connection between the display apparatus and an external apparatus, and a control unit which controls the display unit to operate as a monitor of the external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by the remote controller, and controls the display unit to operate as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Newly-added independent Claim 3 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 3, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display unit of a display apparatus to operate as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the display unit to operate as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Hare is seen to disclose an interface extension system in which the display of a PC can be displayed on a television, thereby permitting users to operate interactive PC games on the screen of a television. However, Hare is not seen to disclose or to suggest that a display of the television is changed based on a mode selected by a remote controller. Thus, Hare is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a display

unit of a display apparatus to operate as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the display unit to operate as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3 are not believed to be anticipated by, nor is it believed that they would have been obvious over, Hare.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 77109 v 1